REMARKS

Examiner has required restriction to one of three inventions, stating that "Inventions I and II are related as subcombinations disclosed as usable together in a single combinations," wherein "invention I has separate utility such as a medical testing/detecting device, wherein the invention II can be used as a molding machine."

Also, Examiner has stated that "Inventions I and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice," wherein "the apparatus as claimed can be used to process a medical testing analysis, while the method can be used to inspect a forming part."

Further, Examiner has stated that "Inventions II and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice," wherein "the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus such as a crystal-forming batch."

Applicant has elected Species I, hereinabove, and respectfully traverses said restriction.

Applicant respectfully asserts that Applicant's sensory inspection system is distinct from medical testing systems, and that Applicant's method is distinct from crystal-formation methods, wherein Applicant's sensory inspection system is directed toward

part-forming machines and methodologies.

Nonetheless, in order to proceed with examination of the application, Applicant has elected Species I, as described hereinabove.

CONCLUSION

The above-made amendments are to form only and thus, no new matter was added. In light of the election and resulting amendment, Applicant respectfully asserts that Claims 1-10 and 27-30 are now allowable. Should there be any questions or concerns, Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted, this 23rd day of January, 2006.

Sandra M. Drummond, Esq.

Reg. No. 45,781

Myers & Kaplan,
Intellectual Property Law, LLC
1899 Powers Ferry Road
Suite 310
Atlanta, GA
(770) 541-7444
(770) 541-7448 facsimile
sdrummond@mkiplaw.com - Email
Attorney Docket Number: 2000-1220-RA7